

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/529,587	04/14/2000	JOHN A. DANE	EPRNT-101XX	2045
Patent Legal St	7590 12/20/200 aff	EXAMINER		
Eastman Kodak	Company	TODD, GREGORY G		
343 State Street Rochester,, NY 14650-2201			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,,			2157	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/20/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/529,587	DANE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Gregory G. Todd	2157	

Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief							
Before the Filling of all Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Gregory G. Todd	2157					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 16 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	THE REPLY FILED 16 November 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 							
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in begappeal; and/or		•	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	-	ected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mnliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)				
		impliant Amendment	(FTOL-324).				
 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>3-5,7,8,10,14-20,23-25,27,28 and 30-3</u>	<u>.</u>						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence is	s necessary and				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa see 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. 		n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).						
•							
	•						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants amendments present new issues requiring further search and consideration. Such issues being at least an event profile relating to the event and correct access information, as well as the content of new claims 35 and 36.

Applicant has only argued claims 32-34 and has not argued the dependent claims nor the added dependent claims.

Applicant's arguments are directed toward, substantially, amended features of the claims. As the amendments are not herein entered, Applicant's arguments are moot.

In response to applicant's argument that Franklin is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Franklin teaches e-commerce allowing for the sale of an array of objects, while Yang teaches such an object that could be sold via e-commerce.

ARIO ETIENNE

SUPERVISORY PAIENT EXAMINE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100